UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/783,673	02/14/2001	Peter M. Mansour	SPROQ1100-1	9661

29585 7590 10/18/2004

GRAY CARY WARE & FREIDENRICH LLP
153 TOWNSEND
SUITE 800
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107

EXAMINER	
ZHONG, CHAD	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2152	

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/783,673	MANSOUR ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Chad Zhong	2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 October 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-53* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-53* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

FINAL ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications:

Amendment, filed on 10/08/2004. This action has been made final.

2. Claims 1-53 are presented for examination. In amendment A, filed on 10/08/2004:

Claims 1, 3, 14, 17, 32, 36, 40 and 41 are amended.

Claims 45-53 are new.

Remaining claims are originally as filed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-6, 8-12, 14-22, 24-44, 45-47, 49-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Simonoff et al. (hereinafter Simonoff), US 6,327,608.

5. As per claim 1, Simonoff teaches a data processing method comprising:

generating, with a client device, a particular form of a client-resident intermediate user interface (UI) for a server-based and client-side controlled application according to a UI format that is based upon a number of device capabilities for said client device, including supplementing a skeletal UI stored in a first memory location with one or more icons, labels or menu items, or combinations thereof, stored in a second memory location (Col. 7, lines 23-30; Col. 9, lines 33-50; Col. 11, lines 60-67);

receiving, at said client device, a number of source data items related to said server-based

application (Col. 9, lines 33-50); and

populating at least one native UI control used by said intermediate UI with said number of source data items (Col. 9, lines 33-50; Col. 14, lines 33-41; Col. 16, lines 40-49).

6. As per claim 2, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said at least one native UI control is associated with an operating system for said client device (Col. 11, lines 64-67).

7. As per claim 3, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

generating an action request in response to a manipulation of said UI by a user of said client device (Col. 12, lines 1-13); and

updating said intermediate UI in response to said action request (Col. 12, lines 1-13).

8. As per claim 4, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

performing an offline action by said client device while said client device operates in a disconnected mode (Col. 10, lines 23-30);

subsequently establishing a session between said client device and a UI server (Col. 9, lines 32-50); and

thereafter transmitting, from said client device to said UI server, a command indicative of said offline action (Col. 9, lines 32-50; Col. 10, lines 34-48).

9. As per claim 5, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 1, further comprising the step of saving said number of source data items in a client cache resident at said client device (Col. 14, lines 44-56).

10. As per claim 6, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 5, further comprising the step of removing client cache items to accommodate said number of source data items (Col. 13, lines 35-44; Col. 14, lines 44-56).

11. As per claim 8, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

receiving, at said client device, a client action command related to said server-based application; and

executing said client action command by said client device (Col. 9, lines 33-50).

12. As per claim 9, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said number of source data items received during said receiving step represent a portion of a larger amount of related data available at a UI server (Col. 16, lines 40-49; Col. 14, lines 44-56; Col. 9, lines 33-50; Col. 10, lines 23-30).

13. As per claim 10, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 9, wherein: said larger amount of related data comprises a list of items; and said number of source data items represents a subset of said list of items (Col. 16, lines 40-49).

14. As per claim 11, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 9, wherein:

said larger amount of related data comprises a document (Col. 9, lines 33-50); and

said number of source data items represents a portion of said document (Col. 9, lines 33-50; Col. 16, lines 40-49).

15. As per claim 12, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 9, wherein:

said larger amount of related data comprises an image; and

said number of source data items represents a portion of said image (Col. 16, lines 40-49).

16. As per claim 14, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 1, further comprising the step of retrieving a command script corresponding to a manipulation of a UI control contained in said intermediate UI, said command script being configured for execution by said client device (Col. 12, lines 1-13).

17. As per claim 15, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 14, further comprising the step of executing, by said client device, said command script in response to the manipulation of said UI control at said client device (Col. 12, lines 1-13; Col. 10, lines 23-30).

18. As per claim 16, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 15, wherein said executing step is performed by said client device in response to an offline manipulation of said UI control at said client device (Col. 10, lines 23-30).

19. As per claim 17, Simonoff teaches a data processing method comprising:

storing a user interface (UI) form definition locally at a client device, said UI form definition being dictated by a number of device capabilities for said client device (Col. 10, lines 23-30);

said client device saving a number of source data items locally, said number of source data items being related to a server-based application (Col. 10, lines 23-30, lines 34-48; Col. 9, lines 33-50);

said client device rendering a UI that is based upon said UI form definition (Col. 9, lines 33-50); and

said client device populating said UI with said number of source data items, and wherein said number of source data items comprises a smaller subset than a total number of source data items related to said server-based application, and wherein further subsets of said total number of source data items are downloadable based upon execution of one or more client-side controls (Col. 9, lines 33-50).

20. As per claim 18, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 17, further comprising the step of receiving, at said client device, said number of source data items from a UI server (Col. 9, lines 33-50).

21. As per claims 19-22, Claims 19-22 are rejected for the same reasons as rejections to claims 3-7 above.

22. As per claim 24, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 21, further comprising the steps of:

updating said UI in response to a manipulation of a display control rendered by said client device (Col. 12, lines 1-13);

requesting an additional number of source data items if said manipulation of said display control triggers a data request command (Col. 12, lines 1-13); and

replacing source data items saved in said client cache with said additional number of source data items (Col. 13, lines 35-44).

23. As per claim 25, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 21, further comprising the steps of:

updating said UI in response to a manipulation of a display control rendered by said client device (Col. 12, lines 1-13);

retrieving additional source data items from said client cache in response to said manipulation of said display control (Col. 12, lines 1-13; Col. 10, lines 23-30); and

displaying said additional source data items in said UI (Col. 12, lines 1-13).

24. As per claim 26, Claim 26 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 8 above.

25. As per claim 27, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 17, wherein said UI form definition is dictated by said server-based application (Col. 7, lines 22-30; Col. 9, lines 33-50).

26. As per claim 28, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 17, wherein said UI form definition identifies at least one native UI control stored locally at said client device (Col. 10, lines 23-30).

27. As per claim 29, Claim 29 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 9 above.

28. As per claim 30, Simonoff teaches a method according to claim 29, further comprising the steps of:

said client device generating a request for additional source data items; and

said client device receiving, from said UI server, a subsequent portion of said total number of source data items (Col. 12, lines 1-13; Col. 16, lines 40-49; Col. 14, lines 44-56; Col. 9, lines 33-50; Col. 10, lines 23-30).

29. As per claim 31, Claim 31 is rejected for the same reason as rejection to claim 15 above.

30. As per claim 32, Simonoff teaches a data processing method comprising:

obtaining a user interface (UI) form definition for a server-based application, where said UI form definition is based upon a number of device capabilities for a client device (Col. 9, lines 33-50);

said client device receiving an instruction to render a particular UI form of a client-resident intermediate UI corresponding to said UI form definition (Col. 9, lines 33-50);

said client device rendering said particular UI form with at least one native UI control associated with an operating system for said client device, including supplementing a skeletal UI stored in a first memory location with one or more icons, labels or menu items, or combinations thereof, stored in a second memory location (Col. 11, lines 64-67);

said client device obtaining a number of data items related to said server-based application (Col. 9, lines 33-50); and

said client device displaying said number of data items in said at least one native UI control (Col. 9, lines 33-50; Col. 10, lines 8-10; Col. 12, lines 59-62).

31. As per claim 33, Claim 33 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 5 above.

32. As per claim 34, Claim 34 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to corresponding section of claim 25 above.

33. As per claim 35, Claim 35 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 24 above.

34. As per claim 36, Simonoff teaches a client device architecture for use with a client device capable of communicating with a data processing server, said client device architecture comprising:

a receive module configured to receive an instruction that identifies a user interface (UI) form definition (Col. 9, lines 33-50);

an operating system (Col. 11, lines 64-67);

a number of native UI controls provided by said operating system (Col. 10, lines 23-30);

a UI form data cache configured to store said UI form definition (Col. 10, lines 23-30, Col. 8, lines 15-19); and

a UI module configured to generate a particular UI form of a client-resident intermediate UI for a server-based application according to said UI form definition (Col. 9, lines 33-50), including supplementing a skeletal UI stored in a first memory location with one or more icons, labels or menu items, or combinations thereof, stored in a second memory location, and to populate at least one of said native UI controls with a number of source data items associated with said server-based application (Col. 9, lines 33-50).

35. As per claim 37-39, Claims 37-39 are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claims 5-7 above, respectively.

36. As per claim 40-41, Claims 40-41 are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claims 24-25 above, respectively.

37. As per claim 42, Simonoff teaches a client device architecture according to claim 36, wherein said receive module is further configured to receive said number of source data items from a remote UI server (Col. 9, lines 33-50).

38. As per claim 43, Simonoff teaches a client device architecture according to claim 36, wherein said receive module is further configured to receive said UI form definition from a remote UI server (Col. 9, lines 33-50).

39. As per claim 44, Simonoff teaches a client device architecture according to claim 36, wherein said UI form definition is based upon a number of device capabilities for said client device (Col. 9, lines 33-50; Col. 11, lines 64-67).

40. As per claim 45-47, 49, claims 45-47, and 49 are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claims 1, 5-6, 24 above respectively.

41. As per claim 50, claim 50 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to combination of claims 24 and 32 above.

42. As per claim 51-53, claims 51-53 are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claims 29, 27 and 32 above respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

43. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

44. Claims 7, 23, 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simonoff et al. (hereinafter Simonoff), US 6,078,322, in view of Dillingham, US 6,327,608.

45. As per claim 7, Simonoff does not teach a method according to claim 6, wherein said removing step selectively removes said client cache items according to a hierarchical preference scheme.

46. Dillingham teaches a method according to claim 6, wherein said removing step selectively removes said client cache items according to a hierarchical preference scheme (Col. 4, lines 25-37; Col. 3, lines 60-61; Col. 8, lines 13-21; Col. 7, lines 30-37).

47. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was made to combine the teaching of Simonoff and Dillingham because they both dealing with server sending client scripts for client side generation of user interface (UI). Furthermore, the teaching of Dillingham to allow wherein said removing step selectively removes said client cache items according to a hierarchical preference scheme would improve the latency and communication costs for Simonoff's system by sorting out the stored cache items in a hierarchy fashion, thus improving speed of update by making update of such a cache in accordance with the sorted list.

48. As per claim 23, Claim 23 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 7 above.

49. As per claim 48, claim 48 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 7 above.

50. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simonoff et al. (hereinafter Simonoff), US 6,078,322, in view of 'Official Notice'.

51. As per claim 13, Simonoff does not teach a method according to claim 9, wherein:

said larger amount of related data comprises a body of text; and

said number of source data items represents a portion of said body of text. However 'Official Notice' is taken by the Examiner that a text file is notoriously well known as a type of file. It would have been obvious to have used a text file for the purpose of the current invention, because doing so would be less burdening for the individual units, through the usage of text file in place of image or a document and the like, the user now have the option of manipulating a portion of the text file thereby improving processing efficiency and speed on the client side, thus realizing a thin client network.

Conclusion

52. Applicant's remarks filed 10/08/2004 have been considered but are found not persuasive in view at the new grounds at rejection necessitated by Applicant's amendment.

52. In the remark, the Applicant argued in substance that Siminoff fails to disclose or suggest limitations of claim 1, instead, Siminoff disclose a universal client device that is embedded as an Applet tag in a web page that is downloaded from a server host to a client device. The universal client of Siminoff is apparently entirely embedded within the webpage and entirely downloaded to a single memory location at the client device.

53. In response to Applicant's amendment, Simonoff teaches the above sections. The GUI objects themselves are being pushed down from the server to client via GUIScript, thus

moving data objects from first memory to second memory is realized. Thus Simonoff teaches the sections stated in claim 1.

54. In the remark, the Applicant argued in substance that Siminoff does not teach the downloading a subset of the total list of data items from the server.

55. In response to Applicant's amendment, Simonoff teaches this section. Referring to Col. 11, lines 60 – Col. 12, lines 13 for instance, user events is causing downloading of additional data items which is inherently a subset of the total data item list available on the server. Simonoff explicitly teaches user events causing download of additional data items from the server. The data items on server in totality is the super set and the subset of data items used for UI generation embedded within the GUIscript is merely a subset of the total data items available on the server. Thus, Simonoff teaches the above section.

56. Applicant's remarks filed 11/25/03 have been considered but are not persuasive. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. Applicant is reined of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

57. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure. The following patents and publications are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to "PLATFORM-INDEPENDENT DISTRIBUTED USER INTERFACE CLIENT ARCHITECTURE".

i.	US 5818447	Wolf et al.
ii.	US 2002/0152244	Dean et al.
iii.	US 6167534	Straathof et al.
iv.	US 6385642	Chlan et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chad Zhong whose telephone number is (703) 305-0718. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on 703-305-8498. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

CZ
October 11, 2004

Dung C. Dinh
Primary Examiner